

1 NEW JERSEY PRIVACY STUDY COMMISSION  
2 ON  
3 HOME ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS IN  
4 GOVERNMENT RECORDS  
5  
6 PUBLIC HEARING  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 AT: RUTGERS UNIVERSITY (CAMDEN CAMPUS)  
12 Campus Center - North Conference Room  
13 326 Penn Street  
14 Camden, New Jersey 08102  
15 DATE: MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2003  
16 TIME: 4:07 p.m. to 6:42 p.m.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 GUY J. RENZI & ASSOCIATES  
22 824 West State Street  
23 Trenton, New Jersey 08618  
24 (609) 989-9199 TOLL FREE (800) 368-7652  
25 <http://www.renziassociates.com>

GUY J. RENZI & ASSOCIATES



1        S U B C O M M I T T E E    M E M B E R S :

2

3        ROSEMARY KARCHER-REAVEY, Chairwoman

4        THOMAS CAFFERTY

5        EDITHE A. FULTON

6        M. LARRY LITWIN

7        PAMELA McCAULEY

8        M. LAWRENCE WILSON, JR.

9

10       B O A R D    P R O F E S S I O N A L S :

11

12       CATHERINE STARGHILL, ESQ., Legal Specialist

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1	I N D E X	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3		
4	OPENING COMMENTS	
5	by Chairwoman Karcher-Reavey	4
6		
7	PUBLIC COMMENTS	
8	by Joyce Powell	7
9	by Matt McCrink	16

10

11

## 12 E X H I B I T S

13

14	ID	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
----	----	-------------	------

15

16 (NO EXHIBITS WERE MARKED.)

17

18

## 19 R E Q U E S T S

20

21 (NO REQUESTS WERE MADE.)

22

23

24

25



1                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY:

2                   Afternoon. It's a little after four  
3 o'clock. I'd like to start the public hearing  
4 simply so that we stay on schedule. I'm Rosemary  
5 Karcher-Reavey. I'm Chair of the Subcommittee on  
6 Public Interest of the Privacy Study Commission,  
7 and we're having these hearings in various parts  
8 of the state. We have actually several members  
9 of the Subcommittee present.

10                  The public hearing is hosted by the  
11 Public Interest Subcommittee of this Commission.  
12 And the Commission was created under the Open  
13 Public Record's Act to study the privacy issues  
14 raised by the collection, processing, use, and  
15 dissemination of information by public agencies.

16                  At this hearing we are inviting the  
17 public to comment specifically on the Special  
18 Directive Subcommittee's Draft Report which was  
19 issued on home addresses and telephone numbers in  
20 government records. The public is also invited  
21 to comment on the general privacy issues raised  
22 by the collection, processing, use, and  
23 dissemination of information by public agencies.

24                  The Special Directive Report  
25 respondent to the Executive Order 26 in which the





1 governor directed the New Jersey Privacy Study  
2 Commission to study the issue of whether and to  
3 what extent the home address and home telephone  
4 numbers of citizens should be made publicly  
5 available by public agencies. The Special  
6 Directive Subcommittee has prepared a brief  
7 statement of this recommendation in summary form  
8 for the public to consider when making its  
9 comments. The handout is located just outside  
10 the room, and the complete draft report can be  
11 reviewed and downloaded from the web site. The  
12 web site is [www.nj.gov/privacy](http://www.nj.gov/privacy).

13 All public comments made today are  
14 being recorded and will be considered by the  
15 entire Commission as part of its study of the  
16 issues. Individuals and people representing  
17 organizations are welcome to make comments, but  
18 we hope you won't exceed five minutes unless it's  
19 necessary. Representatives of organizations with  
20 prepared statements are asked to fill out a form  
21 identifying themselves and provide a copy of that  
22 prepared statement if they have one. That form  
23 is also located on the table outside the room.

24 What I'd ask the people who wish to  
25 comment to do is please come to the microphone,



1 state your name and address -- and I know the  
2 reporter would appreciate it if you would spell  
3 your last name -- tell us if you represent an  
4 organization. And if you do, have you filled out  
5 a form in the back of the room? And also do you  
6 have a copy of your prepared statement? This can  
7 be anonymous. So anybody who would prefer not to  
8 give their name should just indicated that they  
9 would prefer to remain anonymous.

10 And at this juncture, I know that  
11 there are several members of the Committee  
12 present, it seems to me probably appropriate to  
13 ask them if they wish to comment, to do so  
14 because I know they've had private conversations  
15 with individuals. That might be helpful to our  
16 Subcommittee.

17 That's all right, isn't it?

18 Okay. And if you'll give your  
19 statement to Catherine right in the back.

20 MS. STARGHILL: Thank you.

21 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: This is  
22 Joyce Powell. She represents the New Jersey  
23 Education Association whose main office is in  
24 Trenton.

25 And I guess your comments are going



1 to involve school employees' concern with release  
2 of names and addresses.

3 Thank you. Go ahead.

4 MS. POWELL: Good afternoon. I'm  
5 Joyce Powell, Vice President of New Jersey  
6 Education Association.

7 Thank you for the opportunity to  
8 testify today on the subject of great importance  
9 to the 180,000 members of NJAA and other public  
10 employees concerned about protecting their  
11 privacy rights.

12 NJAA believes in accessible and  
13 transparent government. However, we believe that  
14 in the pursuit of that ideal is important that  
15 government not allow the privacy rights of  
16 individuals to be trampled. The inappropriate  
17 release of private information threatens the  
18 safety, security, and peace of mind of the  
19 targeted individuals. We are particularly  
20 concerned about the potential impact of releasing  
21 information about school employees as a distinct  
22 class.

23 The information in question, listed  
24 telephone numbers and home addresses, is  
25 generally and widely available from other



1 sources. Anyone who wants to obtain legitimately  
2 available information about an individual school  
3 employee is already able to do so through other  
4 sources. Our concern centers on releasing  
5 information about school employees as school  
6 employees. With the information about each  
7 individual available in other forums, we see no  
8 public benefit from making school employees'  
9 information publically available.

10           Conversely, there is a significant  
11 potential -- I'm sorry, there is a significant  
12 potential risk of information about groups of  
13 school employees being misused. Suppose, for  
14 example, that a group of students wishes to play  
15 a prank on teachers from their school. Allowing  
16 those students to easily obtain a ready-made list  
17 of their teachers' phone numbers and addresses  
18 would invite abuse. Whether due to vandalism,  
19 prank phone calls, or even something more  
20 serious, school employees would be unnecessarily  
21 and inappropriately exposed to a threat by the  
22 release of their information.

23           And the threat could well be much  
24 more serious if a violent or disgruntled student  
25 or community member obtains the information for





1 more sinister purposes. There can be no doubt  
2 that such individuals exist in some of our  
3 communities. If districts are required to  
4 release the information about their employees,  
5 they would be, in essence, required to provide  
6 such a potential predator with a ready-made hit  
7 list.

8 Teachers and school employees are  
9 exposed to a great deal of public scrutiny by the  
10 nature of their work. And occasionally students,  
11 parents, or community members act in  
12 inappropriate and abusive ways towards them.  
13 While at schools, employees have the protection  
14 afforded to them by the school environment. But  
15 if their personal information, including phone  
16 numbers and addresses, become easily available to  
17 the public, they may find themselves confronted  
18 or attacked by such disgruntled individuals while  
19 away from the safety of the school.

20 No public good is served by forcing  
21 school districts to reveal information about the  
22 private addresses and telephone numbers of school  
23 employees. Weighed against the potential for  
24 mischief or much worse, it is clear that such  
25 information should be protected.



1                   I urge this task force to use its  
2           influence to protect the privacy rights of  
3           New Jersey citizens who work in public schools.  
4           We can accomplish this worthwhile goal of  
5           government transparency without taking unneeded  
6           and the potentially dangerous step of releasing  
7           the personnel contact information of school  
8           employees.

9                   Thank you for your kind attention.

10                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Thank  
11           you.

12                   I would just want know, you're not  
13           limiting this to teachers and all --

14                   MS. POWELL: All school employees.

15                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Just so  
16           we're clear.

17                   MS. POWELL: Administrators, as well  
18           as the maintenance folks, cafeteria employees,  
19           secretaries.

20                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY:  
21           Everybody.

22                   MS. POWELL: All the individuals  
23           that are involved in schools because sometimes a  
24           student could have some difficulty with any of  
25           the caregivers and the school employees in the



1 building.

2 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Sure.

3 Thank you.

4 Anybody have any questions of --

5 MR. LITWIN: What would you term  
6 appropriate release of information -- what would  
7 be appropriate for the release of an employee's  
8 home address?

9 MS. POWELL: Appropriate release. I  
10 think with the permission of the employee. If a  
11 parent calls the school and the parent asks to  
12 contact the person at home, then it's appropriate  
13 that the teacher or the individual knows that  
14 person would want to contact them. And they'd  
15 say to someone, "I would give my permission for  
16 them to contact me." That would be appropriate  
17 for them to then speak with them about some  
18 difficulty that -- or something nice that's going  
19 on with the student. Because we do have those  
20 things that happen with students that are  
21 wonderful things that school employees like to  
22 acknowledge.

23 MR. CAFFERTY: Other than the  
24 personnel file, where might the names and  
25 addresses of teachers or other employees be



1       available?

2                   MS. POWELL:  Well, if they're listed  
3       in the telephone book, for instance.

4                   MR. CAFFERTY:  But, of course, we  
5       don't have any control over the telephone book.  
6       So I guess my question is -- and the reason I'm  
7       asking the question is, under the law information  
8       in their personnel file is not accessible and  
9       would not be accessible.  So my question to you  
10      really is where else would somebody be able to  
11      access the names and phone numbers of teachers  
12      that are contained in a government record?

13                  MS. POWELL:  Where else would they  
14      be able to get that information?

15                  MR. CAFFERTY:  Yeah.  Where else in  
16      the government record -- I mean, if they went to  
17      the school board --

18                  MS. POWELL:  -- could they get that  
19      information?

20                  MR. CAFFERTY:  I mean, where does  
21      the school board keep the list of names and  
22      addresses of employees other than in their  
23      personnel file, which is not accessible?

24                  MS. POWELL:  There might be snow  
25      lists.  There might be lists for emergency.





1       Particularly now after 911, there are many  
2       emergency lists that are in the building that we  
3       would be concerned about people getting their  
4       hands on that list.

5                   MR. CAFFERTY:   Okay.

6                   MR. LITWIN:   I'm just curious, do  
7       schools still -- I probably know the answer to  
8       this -- they don't still distribute the class  
9       list that would include the teacher's phone  
10      number at the top of the list, do they?  Do you  
11      know?

12                  MS. POWELL:   Not that I'm aware of.  
13      I don't believe that a class list is  
14      distributed -- with the teacher's home phone  
15      number?

16                  MR. LITWIN:   With the home, yeah.  I  
17      can remember years ago for PTA purposes or PTO  
18      purposes, and in addition to all the students'  
19      home phone numbers, they also would have the  
20      teacher's home phone number on top.

21                  MS. POWELL:   I don't believe that we  
22      would list any student phone numbers on any type  
23      of list.  Obviously, there might be high school  
24      clubs that meet where kids, again, voluntarily  
25      put their information on a list that they



1       distribute amongst one another for club purposes  
2       or team purposes. I would imagine that teams --  
3       I coached softball. We would have a list of the  
4       phone numbers of the students so that they could  
5       contact one another for rides and things like  
6       that. That could possibly -- a teacher or a  
7       coach could put their phone number on there.

8                       And that's another aspect that -- I  
9       didn't state in the testimony, but we often have  
10      heard about the difficulties with sports and with  
11      events where parents have been disgruntled if a  
12      student hasn't been played in a sport, hasn't had  
13      playing time. It's things like that where we  
14      would be very concerned if that information were  
15      so easily accessible because sometimes people  
16      react in a very negative way in those situations.

17                     MR. LITWIN: Because even what I'm  
18      thinking, in addition to the personnel file, you  
19      said it with snow lists, many times principals  
20      would have a separate list that would contain  
21      home addresses and phone numbers. And then that  
22      is another wrinkle to it because it's not being  
23      requested out of the personnel file --

24                     MS. POWELL: Exactly.

25                     MR. LITWIN: -- but walking in and



1 saying "I want that list."

2 MS. POWELL: "I want the snow list,"  
3 or "I want the --

4 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Do you  
5 think that would be considered a public record?

6 MR. LITWIN: Well, I don't know  
7 legally --

8 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Tom said  
9 yes.

10 MR. LITWIN: -- but, yeah, I was  
11 going to say yes. Tom said yes.

12 MR. CAFFERTY: And that's why I was  
13 trying to identify what other locations that  
14 there might be that would be a government record.

15 MS. POWELL: A team list, I think,  
16 too, would probably be some kind of a public  
17 record. If you have a team, sporting team, or as  
18 I said, club activities, would think once those  
19 things are written down it becomes public.

20 Again, thank you.

21 MR. LITWIN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Thank  
23 you.

24 If anybody else that wants to be  
25 heard, that's fine. Not necessarily from your



1 organization, but anybody. We're going to have  
2 two more hearings: Rutgers Newark and the one  
3 down in Berkley Township.

4 (Recess was taken. Time is 4:24 p.m.)

5 (Back on the record. Time is 5:26 p.m.)

6 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: We are  
7 recording it. We have a court reporter and a  
8 tape, so please don't talk as fast as I do. And  
9 we'd love to hear what you have to say.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. McCRINK: Thank you.

12 For the record, Matthew McCrink,  
13 law firm McCrink, Nelson & Kehler. I'm a Rutgers  
14 alumni. I'm here for a Rutgers Trustee meeting  
15 for the Law School. I had a very brief chance to  
16 review the report you issued and make the  
17 following comments as appropriately as I can.

18 I personally believe that we're  
19 evolving whether we like it or not in the  
20 information age. And the reality of it is, is if  
21 you go on the internet these days, much of the  
22 information we're talking about is already there.

23 I found most interestingly, awhile  
24 back, I put my name in the search engine that I  
25 had seven hits. And it was most interesting to





1 read about myself because I had no clue that I  
2 was there. I guess there is something to be said  
3 for some type of control of that.

4 I offer as a thought -- which is  
5 probably not really the parameters which you're  
6 talking about -- that one of the things we might  
7 think about having the government do now that  
8 they've given us this wonderful internet toy is  
9 to create some type of government registry where  
10 people can voluntarily submit information.

11 So if people want to know about Matt  
12 McCrink or anyone else, they can go on this  
13 voluntary registry and that registry could be, in  
14 fact, a free registry, and everyone would have  
15 the right to put information they want. Anyone  
16 who wanted to go there can get whatever  
17 information is on that registry. Then no one  
18 would have any complaints because of the fact  
19 that anyone who had information there had  
20 voluntarily given that information.

21 It could also be used for  
22 cross-reference purposes. If someone was looking  
23 for job qualifications and they wanted to  
24 establish, in effect, their credibility, if they  
25 were on this registry, it could be verified.



1                   But, again, it's an alternative to  
2           saying we could give everyone carte blanche to  
3           look at someone's personal records. I think if  
4           you look at this registry and the people involved  
5           had totally given that information, there  
6           wouldn't be a problem.

7                   I personally don't have a problem  
8           with the concept of public access records. But I  
9           do have a problem with the degree. Obviously, I  
10          think that people that want to find out about  
11          someone, they could do it already to a certain  
12          degree. But I really don't think that my, for  
13          instance, medical history, religious beliefs are  
14          appropriate. I guess we're dealing with a matter  
15          or level of certain things I think there should  
16          be reasonable restrictions on.

17                   I think a reasonable degree of  
18          privacy expectation includes the concept that,  
19          well, yes, you could find out where I live,  
20          perhaps, but I don't know if I want you to know  
21          about my psychological history, or my physical  
22          history or whatnot.

23                   I have strong feelings in opposition  
24          to anonymous requests. I think that if someone  
25          wants to find out about me that I should know who



1       they are. There should be some form of  
2       significant identifier. And the fact they put  
3       their name down as Joe Smith I don't know is  
4       sufficient. Perhaps if someone is asking about  
5       someone else, they should identify who they are.

6                       And the reason I say that, one of  
7       the reasons would be for information gathering.  
8       I suspect in this age of technology and  
9       computers, we could probably create a secondary  
10      registry of who made the inquiries and find out  
11      whether we're dealing with telemarketers or  
12      whether we're dealing with persons in police  
13      enforcements. We basically can control some  
14      fashion who's getting information to see whether  
15      there are abuses here.

16                      Obviously, one of the issues that  
17      strikes me is one of concern is, is someone  
18      trying to find that information about me because  
19      they want to sell me something or they want to  
20      target me or my family for some type of hustle  
21      activity? And knowing about where I live, where  
22      my vacation homes are, what my economic status is  
23      may make me being a victim more easy for them.  
24      So I think there should be some verification.  
25      Someone asks about me, I should know who they



1       are. It shouldn't be anonymous.

2                   I have a major problem with them  
3       getting my phone number. My address, I really  
4       don't have a problem. They can mail it to me and  
5       it can go in the trash with all the rest of the  
6       unwanted mail. My phone number is private to me  
7       and it's a situation where I've just gone through  
8       the wonderful experience and gotten on the No  
9       Call list and be protected from those six or  
10      seven calls I used to get a night. And very  
11      frankly, whether it's the government or anyone  
12      else, I really don't want anyone having my phone  
13      number unless I give it to them, so I would have  
14      a problem with that.

15                  Let's face it, there are many  
16      things. Over the years I've gotten gun permits.  
17      When I went through any military clearance, I had  
18      to give them all of my information. There's  
19      probably a huge dossier somewhere in Washington  
20      on Matt McCrink. But it's not anyone's business  
21      in my mind.

22                  But the truth of the matter is --  
23      and maybe this is something which should be  
24      considered -- if I get in trouble, if anyone gets  
25      in trouble, if they're perhaps suspected of





1 crime, well, then maybe there should be a second  
2 tier authorization that, hey, if that person now  
3 has to be investigated because of criminal  
4 activity, you give a degree of access to the  
5 records to see if there is some type of  
6 indication in the record of background that this  
7 person has a possibility or probability of  
8 criminal activity. And I think whoever asks  
9 should pay a processing fee.

10 I personally -- maybe it's a  
11 function of my getting old, but the truth of the  
12 matter is I don't think we should be doing all  
13 this for free. If someone needs to know, they  
14 should pay a reasonable fee. Whether it be \$3.00  
15 or \$5.00, whatever, they're creating work for  
16 other people. This should not be something that  
17 we as a taxpayer have to pay for. If they want  
18 the information, then they should pay for it.  
19 And that, in effect, would make this process  
20 self-funding.

21 What it also would do, it would cut  
22 down, in mind, on frivolous type of applications  
23 where people trying to get 2,000 names off the  
24 air so they can do a mass mailing to see if they  
25 want to sell their homes because homes are



1       selling very well right now. But if they have  
2       spend \$3,000 or \$5,000 for that list, then  
3       they're not going to do it. They'll go and buy  
4       it the way they normally did from lead persons.

5                       But, again, I think it's something  
6       that should be self-funding. I don't think it's  
7       unreasonable that somebody wants to find out  
8       something that they be charged a fee. And,  
9       again, you can limit the scope if someone is with  
10      law enforcement or with some type of a duly  
11      authorized agency where they request this  
12      information. Fine, you can give a waive for  
13      something like that.

14                      But I think if -- and when I'm  
15      reading this, this kind of broad latitude, if  
16      anybody requests anything under the, I guess,  
17      Freedom of Information Act and all the plethora  
18      sections connected with that, I don't know why  
19      the government or we should pay for that. If you  
20      want to know, you should pay the cost for that.  
21      And again it's going to be difficult to ascertain  
22      that so at the very least some type of fund or  
23      request fee.

24                      We do it in the legal system pretty  
25      much for everything now. You want to file a



1 motion, you pay a fee. If you want to, you know,  
2 in effect do something that costs the system  
3 something, you pay the request fees, and that's  
4 how you self-fund, again, without creating a tax  
5 situation.

6 With that, I depart for what it's  
7 worth.

8 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Thank  
9 you.

10 Would you mind if I asked you one  
11 question?

12 MR. McCRINK: Sure.

13 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Listed  
14 or unlisted phone numbers, that would make a  
15 difference. I assume you're talking about  
16 unlisted phone numbers.

17 MR. McCRINK: Correct. If you have  
18 your phone number listed, you're basically  
19 allowing anyone to get access to it to start  
20 with. If you've taken the time to have it  
21 unlisted, you've done that for a reason.

22 Now I will be honest with you, I  
23 think that this telemarketing ban may help, I  
24 think, a lot will become unlisted. But  
25 truthfully, with those machines they have where



1       they could just dial randomly, they got all the  
2       unlisted numbers anyway. And they even had, I  
3       think, a machine that was a pinger that would  
4       call -- you know, you get the phone, you picked  
5       it up and there was nobody there? Well, they  
6       were just testing if somebody would answer the  
7       phone and they would sell those numbers.

8                 So, I mean, the truth is technology  
9       is here; we're not going to make it go away. But  
10      the reality of it is we have to cope with it. We  
11      have to do so in such a fashion where people get  
12      the human treatment. And, again, legislation can  
13      be scoped and shaped to do that.

14                Again, I think we have to be  
15      realistic. A lot of the information's out there  
16      already whether we like it or not. And the  
17      secondary question becomes in our free laissez  
18      faire society -- and I'm a flaming liberal, by  
19      the way. I'll admit that.

20                But the truth of the matter is there  
21      are still reasonable limits. There are some  
22      things, you know, which are still in my mind  
23      private. Okay?

24                I've handled, for instance, divorces  
25      over the years for people, good, honest,





1       respectable people. But there are some very  
2       private personal things in those divorces. If  
3       that came out, some of them would be ruined. I  
4       mean, when I have my office in Fort Dix, I used  
5       to represent of military officers all the time  
6       for divorces. Every one of them had an affair.  
7       Well, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice  
8       that's an indictable offense. They haven't quite  
9       caught up with the rest of us. But if my divorce  
10      files, for instance, were to get out, you could  
11      have a number of them facing military charges.  
12      So there are things which I think have to be  
13      reasonably limited.

14                 There's some things, I'm sure if  
15      anybody that has ever had a nervous breakdown or  
16      went through a tough emotional time and went for  
17      counseling, they don't want it on the public  
18      access that they had emotional counseling because  
19      then they're going to be branded as a kook or a  
20      nut and not get a job. People are like that,  
21      that's the reality.

22                 So there are sensitive things. And  
23      to me, if I were to be asked what my expectation  
24      privacy is, it would certainly be for any medical  
25      records, psychiatric records, and frankly



1 military records.

2 CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: Thank  
3 you very much.

4 MR. McCRINK: Sure.

5 MS. FULTON: One of the  
6 recommendations may possibly be that the  
7 legislature that categories -- that job category  
8 that would be exempted such as judges or law  
9 enforcement, in my particular case, I would be  
10 looking for school employees to have some  
11 protection from having their employer release  
12 names, addresses, and telephone numbers. And we  
13 know that if you're in the telephone book, you're  
14 there, but for the employer to do it --

15 MR. McCRINK: Well, I think you have  
16 certain what I would call "target occupations"  
17 that need to be protected. Obviously, law  
18 enforcement: police officers, probation officers  
19 judges, people who have to be concerned that  
20 people may be looking for them. They want to  
21 know where they live. What's that thing "I know  
22 where you live"? Well, guess what? When we put  
23 these people in positions of responsibility and  
24 trust and they had to make hard decisions which  
25 people don't always like, then we need to protect



1       those people.

2                   I think anyone in a sensitive  
3       position such as that needs an additional degree  
4       of protection.  And, again, a situation where you  
5       might have not an immunity but the limitation on  
6       access to the record unless some justification is  
7       shown.  I mean, we might have a situation where  
8       if someone feels it's appropriate and proper to  
9       get access to take certain person's records, they  
10      have to file a special application for that, if  
11      this person's in this limited category.  And that  
12      application would have to set forth the criteria  
13      and would be passed on.  But, again, when they  
14      did that, they'd have to pay a hire application  
15      free because somebody's got to pay for that  
16      person to look at the application, would be my  
17      thought process on.

18                   MS. FULTON:  Thank you.

19                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY:  If you  
20      have anybody that's going to be around Rutgers  
21      Newark on Wednesday or down in the Bayville area,  
22      Berkley Township in Ocean County on Thursday --

23                   MR. McCRINK:  I'm going to the  
24      Rutgers Law Trustee in about 20 minutes where I  
25      have a free dinner, which is why I'm coming



1       now -- the bottom line is I'll mention this and  
2       maybe you can get few more people.

3                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY:  We'd  
4       appreciate this.

5                   MR. McCRINK:  How long are you here?

6                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY:  Seven.

7                   MR. McCRINK:  They probably won't be  
8       done eating by then, but perhaps.

9                   MS. FULTON:  We'll come and join you  
10      for dinner.

11                  MR. McCRINK:  Actually, it's Rutgers  
12      food that's pretty darn good.  I'll tell you  
13      truthfully, I came here 30 years ago, the food's  
14      a lot better now then it was back then.

15                  (Discussion held off the record.)

16                  (Back on the record.)

17                  MR. LITWIN:  I'll see you folks on  
18      Friday I've got to run.

19                  (Mr. Litwin leaves the meeting.

20      Time is 5:38 p.m.)

21                  MR. CAFFERTY:  I have to leave, too.

22                  (Mr. Cafferty leaves the meeting.

23      Time is 5:38 p.m.)

24                  (Discussion off the record.)

25                  (Back on the record.)





1                   CHAIRWOMAN KARCHER-REAVEY: It's  
2           almost 7:00, and I think we'll indicate for the  
3           record that we are going to close the meeting.  
4           We don't expect any other members of the public  
5           to appear. I want to thank the members of the  
6           Subcommittee and our liaison, Catherine, and  
7           we'll all meet again Wednesday night. And thank  
8           you very much.

9                   MS. FULTON: Thank you, Judge, very  
10          much.

11

12                   (HEARING CONCLUDED AT 6:50 P.M.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



## 1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 I, LINDA P. CALAMARI, a Notary Public of the  
4 State of New Jersey, do hereby certify the  
5 foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of  
6 my original stenographic notes taken at the time  
7 and place hereinbefore set forth.

8

9

10

-----

11

LINDA P. CALAMARI

12

13

14

15 Dated: DECEMBER 5, 2003.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

